



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,106	04/14/2004	Janaki P. Kumar	13906-171001 / 2004P00206	6151
32864	7590	11/30/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			COUGHLAN, PETER D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2129	

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/824,106

Applicant(s)

KUMAR, JANAKI P.

Examiner

Peter Coughlan

Art Unit

2129

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 4/14/2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## Detailed Action

1. This office action is in response to an AMENDMENT entered September 25, 2006 for the patent application 10/824106 filed on April 14, 2004.
2. The First Office Action of April 25, 2006 is fully incorporated into this Final Office Action by reference.

### ***Status of Claims***

3. Claims 1-21 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 18, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hernandez in view of Ball ('SAP R/3 Implementation guide, referred to as **Hernandez**; U. S. Patent 6529863, referred to as **Ball**)

Claims. 1, 18, 20.

Hernandez teaches displaying a graphical user interface (GUI) on a display device of a computer, the GUI including (**Hernandez**, p225:18-27; 'GUI' of applicant is equivalent to 'GUI' or "SAPGUI' of Hernandez.) a representation of a condition of a user-defined rule that may be used to process textual information. (**Hernandez**, p14:17-19), wherein the condition includes an attribute name, an operator (**Hernandez**, p85)

Hernandez does not teach and an attribute value.

Ball teaches and an attribute value. (**Ball**, C15:42-52; 'Attribute name' and 'attribute value' of applicant is equivalent to "name of the event' and 'data associated with the event' of Ball.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Hernandez by associating a value to a name as taught by Ball to have an attribute value.

For the purpose of having a two data fields where one is associated with another.

Hernandez teaches receiving user input via the GUI, the user input indicating the user defined rule is to be used to create a rule template (**Hernandez**, p231:10-18; 'Rule template' of applicant is equivalent to 'function builder' of Hernandez. A user can create their own functions, thus 'user defined rule' of applicant is equivalent to 'function' of Hernandez.), creating, in response to the received user input a rule template having a

condition that is based upon the condition of the user-defined rule (**Hernandez**, p424:11-14), wherein the condition of the rule template (**Hernandez**, p211:21-22) includes the attribute name and the operator from the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule. (**Hernandez**, p85) and wherein the condition of the rule template further includes an attribute-value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule. (**Hernandez**, p206:15; 'Associated' of applicant is equivalent to 'mapping' of Hernandez.)

receiving a second user input that indicates a value to be used in place of the attribute value placeholder (**Hernandez**, p204:9 through p206:28; 'Second user input' of applicant is equivalent to 'data from old systems' (Legacy systems) of Hernandez.) , and

creating in response to the second user input, a second user defined rule to process textual information, the second user defined rule being based on the rule template and including the value to be used in place of the attribute value placeholder. (**Hernandez**, p337:34 through p338:2 and p228:33 through p229:13; 'Creating a response' of applicant is equivalent to the 'executive information systems' of Hernandez. 'Textual information' of applicant is equivalent to 'data coming from several R/3 applications' of Hernandez. 'Textual' can be defined by 'type declarations' of Hernandez. The 'second user defined rule' of applicant is the function(s) needed to transform legacy system data into data which SAP can utilize.)

Claim 4.

Hernandez teaches wherein the conditions of the user-defined rule are connected by at least one logical operator. (**Hernandez**, p85)

Claim 6.

Hernandez teaches wherein the conditions of the rule template are connected by at least one logical operator: (**Hernandez**, p85)

Claims 9.

Hernandez teaches the second user-defined rule is used to process textual information contained in email messages or in search queries. (**Hernandez**, p144:13-17, p184:14 through 185:1 and p229:1-8; By using 'data type declarations' of Hernandez, any type of 'textual information' can be implemented or required.)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 2, 3, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Hernandez and Ball, as set forth above, and further in view of Whelihan (U. S. Patent Publication 20030129659, referred to as **Whelihan**).

Claim 2.

Hernandez and Ball do not teach the method further comprises storing the rule template in a repository that is accessible to the user.

Whelihan teaches the method further comprises storing the rule template in a repository that is accessible to the user. (**Whelihan**, ¶0072) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify combined teachings of Hernandez and Ball by saving inputted information as taught by Whelihan to have a method that further comprises storing the rule template in a repository that is accessible to the user.

For the purpose of not having to duplicate information input.

### Claim 3.

Hernandez and Ball do not teach the user-defined rule contains a plurality of conditions that each include an attribute name, an operator, and an attribute value.

Whelihan teaches the user-defined rule contains a plurality of conditions that each include an attribute name, an operator, and an attribute value. (**Whelihan**, abstract; 'User-defined rule' of applicant is equivalent to 'tables of projects' of Whelihan.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify combined teachings of Hernandez and Ball by illustrating what fields are in the user defined rules as taught by Whelihan to have the user-defined rule contain a plurality of conditions that each include an attribute name, an operator, and an attribute value.

For the purpose of defining what fields are to be incorporated into a user defined rule.

Claims 5.

Hernandez and Ball do not teach the rule template contains a plurality of conditions that each correspond to one of the conditions of the user-defined rule and that each include the attribute name and the operator from the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule.

Whelihan teaches the rule template contains a plurality of conditions that each correspond to one of the conditions of the user-defined rule and that each include the attribute name and the operator from the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule. (**Whelihan**, abstract; Before data in the form of 'attribute name' and 'operator' is saved it is considered 'user-defined rule' After it is saved it is in the form directed by **Ball's** template it is considered a rule template.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify combined teachings of Hernandez and Ball by illustrating that a user defined rules have parameters as taught by Whelihan to have the rule template contains a plurality of conditions that each correspond to one of the conditions of the user-defined rule and that each include the attribute name and the operator from the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule.

For the purpose of illustrating when inputted information is saved it is not lost.



***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 7, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Hernandez and Ball, as set forth above, and further in view of Sharpe ('Teach Yourself SAP R/3', referred to as **Sharpe**).

Claim 7.

Hernandez and Ball do not teach the attribute-value placeholder in the condition of the rule template includes at least one placeholder symbol and a placeholder name.

Sharpe teaches the attribute-value placeholder in the condition of the rule template includes at least one placeholder symbol and a placeholder name. (**Sharpe**, p59, Figure 7.5; 'Attribute-value placeholder' and 'placeholder symbol' of applicant is equivalent to 'item field' and the actual 'item field' in the display of Sharpe.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify combined teachings of Hernandez and Ball by illustrating the fact of the existence of an entry field for data as taught by Sharpe to have the attribute-value placeholder in the condition of the rule template include at least one placeholder symbol and a placeholder name.

For the purpose of knowing the location of where to place incoming data.

Claims 8.

Hernandez and Ball do not teach the placeholder name is based on the attribute name of the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule.

Sharpe teaches the placeholder name is based on the attribute name of the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule. (**Sharpe**, p15:9-10; If the fields in SAP accept information in the field then that information corresponds to the user-defined rule information.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify combined teachings of Hernandez and Ball by illustrating the relationship between the 'placeholder name' and the 'corresponding condition' of the user-defined rule as taught by Sharpe to have the placeholder name is based on the attribute name of the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule.

For the purpose of linking the location of the placeholder name to the data field with the 'attribute name'

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 10, 11, 17, 19, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hernandez in view of Morwood ('SAP R/3 Implementation guide, referred to as **Hernandez**; U. S. Patent Publication 20020091695, referred to as **Morwood**)

Claims. 10, 19, 21.

Hernandez teaches displaying a graphical user interface (GUI) on a display device of a computer (**Hernandez**, p225:18-27; 'GUI' of applicant is equivalent to 'GUI'

Art Unit: 2129

or "SAPGUI" of Hernandez.), the GUI including a representation of an action of a user-defined rule that may be used to process textual information. (**Hernandez**, p14:17-19)

Hernandez does not teach wherein the action includes an action name and a value

Morwood teaches wherein the action includes an action name and a value. (**Morwood**; ¶0058; 'Action name' and 'value' of applicant is equivalent to 'name' and 'filePrefix' of Morwood.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Hernandez by illustrating names to variables as taught by Morwood to have the action includes an action name and a value

Hernandez teaches receiving user input via the GUI the user input indicating the user defined rule is to be used to create a template (**Hernandez**, p231:10-18; 'Rule template' of applicant is equivalent to 'function builder' of Hernandez. A user can create their own functions, thus 'user defined rule' of applicant is equivalent to 'function' of Hernandez.), create, in response to the received user input, a rule template having an action that is based upon the action of the user-defined rule (**Hernandez**, p424:11-14), wherein the action of the rule template (**Hernandez**, p18:18-21) includes the action name from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule, and wherein the action of the rule template (**Hernandez**, p18:18-21) further includes a value placeholder that is associated with the value from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule. (**Hernandez**, p206:15; 'Associated' of applicant is equivalent to 'mapping' of Hernandez.)

receiving a second user input that indicates a value to be used in place of the value placeholder (**Hernandez**, p204:9 through p206:28; 'Second user input' of applicant is equivalent to 'data from old systems' (Legacy systems) of Hernandez.) , and

creating, in response to the second user input, a second user defined rule to process textual information, the second user defined rule being based on the rule template and including the value to be used in place of the value placeholder. (**Hernandez**, p337:34 through p338:2 and p228:33 through p229:13; 'Creating a response' of applicant is equivalent to the 'executive information systems' of Hernandez. 'Textual information' of applicant is equivalent to 'data coming from several R/3 applications' of Hernandez. 'Textual' can be defined by 'type declarations' of Hernandez The 'second user defined rule' of applicant is the function(s) needed to transform legacy system data into data which SAP can utilize.)

Claim 11.

Hernandez does not teach wherein the action of the user-defined rule further includes an attribute name and an attribute value wherein the action of the rule template includes the attribute name from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule, and wherein the action of the rule template further includes an attribute-value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule.

Morwood teaches wherein the action of the user-defined rule further includes an attribute name and an attribute value (**Morwood**, ¶0058; 'Attribute name' and 'attribute value' of applicant is equivalent to 'pathName' and 'deleteFile' of Morwood.) wherein the action of the rule template includes the attribute name from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule, and wherein the action of the rule template further includes an attribute-value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule. (**Morwood**, ¶0066; 'Assignment statements' of Morwood make the necessary corresponding relationships with the 'attribute name' and 'attribute value' of the user defined rule.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Hernandez by associating other data fields with other names as taught by Morwood to have the action of the user-defined rule further includes an attribute name and an attribute value wherein the action of the rule template includes the attribute name from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule, and wherein the action of the rule template further includes an attribute-value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule.

For the purpose of illustrating the fact one can associate names with data fields.

Claim 17.

Hernandez teaches the user-defined rule may be used to process textual information contained in email messages or in search queries. (**Hernandez**, p144:13-17 and p184:14 through 185:1)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 12, 13, 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Hernandez and Morwood, as set forth above, and further in view of Whelihan (U. S. Patent Publication 20030129659, referred to as **Whelihan**).

**Claim 12.**

Hernandez and Morwood do not teach the method further comprises storing the rule template in a repository that is accessible to the user.

Whelihan teaches the method further comprises storing the rule template in a repository that is accessible to the user. (**Whelihan**, ¶0072) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify combined teachings of Hernandez and Morwood by saving inputted data of the user defined rule template taught by Whelihan to have the method further comprises storing the rule template in a repository that is accessible to the user.

For the purpose of being able to save inputted information so that the information does not have to be entered again.

Art Unit: 2129

Claim 13.

Hernandez and Morwood do not teach the user-defined rule contains a plurality of actions that each include an action name and a value.

Whelihan teaches the user-defined rule contains a plurality of actions that each include an action name and a value. (**Whelihan**, abstract; 'User-defined rule' of applicant is equivalent to 'tables of projects' of Whelihan.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify combined teachings of Hernandez and Morwood by illustrating that data fields have names as taught by Whelihan to the user-defined rule contains a plurality of actions that each include an action name and a value.

For the purpose of associating a value of an action to a name of an action.

Claim 14.

Hernandez and Morwood do not teach the rule template contains a plurality of actions that each correspond to one of the actions of the user-defined rule and that each include the action name from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule.

Whelihan teaches the rule template contains a plurality of actions that each correspond to one of the actions of the user-defined rule and that each include the action name from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule. (**Whelihan**, abstract; Before data in the form of 'attribute name' and 'operator' is saved it is considered 'user-defined rule' After it is saved it is in the form directed by **Morwood** interface it is considered a rule template.) It would have been obvious to a person

Art Unit: 2129

having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify combined teachings of Hernandez and Morwood by saving inputted data from a user defined rule as taught by Whelihan to have the rule template contains a plurality of actions that each correspond to one of the actions of the user-defined rule and that each include the action name from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule.

For the purpose of forming a correlation between action and the action name of a user defined rule.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 15, 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Hernandez and Morwood, as set forth above, and further in view of Sharpe ('Teach Yourself SAP R/3', referred to as **Sharpe**).

Claim 15.

Hernandez and Morwood do not teach the value placeholder in the action of the rule template includes at least one placeholder symbol and a placeholder name.

Sharpe teaches the value placeholder in the action of the rule template includes at least one placeholder symbol and a placeholder name. (**Sharpe**, p59, Figure 7.5; 'Attribute-value placeholder' and 'placeholder symbol' of applicant is equivalent to 'item field' and the actual 'item field' in the display of Sharpe.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify



Art Unit: 2129

combined teachings of Hernandez and Morwood by illustrating the actual field in which the user can input data as taught by Sharpe to have the value placeholder in the action of the rule template includes at least one placeholder symbol and a placeholder name.

For the purpose of aiding the user where to input data.

Claim 16.

Hernandez and Morwood do not teach the placeholder name is based on the action name of the corresponding action of the user-defined rule.

Sharpe teaches the placeholder name is based on the action name of the corresponding action of the user-defined rule. (**Sharpe**, p15:9-10; If the fields in SAP accept information in the field then that information corresponds to the user-defined rule information.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify combined teachings of Hernandez and Morwood by linking the placeholder to the field of action name as taught by Sharpe to have the placeholder name is based on the action name of the corresponding action of the user-defined rule.

For the purpose of making sure the inputted data is associated to the correct data field.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed on September 25, 2006 for claims 1-21 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

6. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

In response to the action of April 25, 2006, applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks. Claims 1-21 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 10 and 18-21 are independent. Claims 1, 9, 10 and 17-21 have been amended. Support for these amendments may be found in the application at, for example, page 4 line 17 to page 5, line 28. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 1-8, 10-16 and 18-21 stand rejected under 25 U.S.C. §101 for nonstatutory subject matter. In response, independent claims 1, 10 and 18-21 have been amended to recite creating, in response to user input a user-defined rule to process textual information. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdraw of this rejection of independent claims 1, 10 and 18-21 and claims 2-8, which depend from claim 1, and 12-17 which depend from claim 10.

Examiner's response:

Examiner withdraws the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection.

7. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hernandez ("SAP R/3 Implementation Guide") in view of Ball (U. S. Patent No. 6529863). Applicant request reconsideration and withdraw of these rejections because any proper combination of Hernandez and Ball does not describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 1, 18 and 20.

Art Unit: 2129

Claim 1 as amended, recites a computer implemented method that displays a graphical user interface (GUI) on a display device of a computer, where the UI includes a representation of a condition of a user defined rule to process textual information. The condition includes an attribute name, an operator, and an attribute value. The method also includes receiving, via the GUI, user input that indicates the user defined rule is to be used to create a rule template and, in response, creating a rule template. The rule template has a condition that is based upon the condition of the user-defined rule. The condition of the rule template includes, among other elements, an attribute value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding condition of the user defined rule. The method also includes receiving a second user input that indicates a value to be used in place of the attribute value placeholder and, in response, creating a second user defined rule to process textual information. The second user defined rule is based on the rule template and includes the value to be used in place of the attribute value placeholder.

Hernandez discloses techniques for implementing SAP R/3 Release 3.0. See Hernandez at page 14. Hernandez discloses, among other disclosures, the R/3 Reference Model, on which business process modeling tools are based. See Hernandez at page 84. However, Hernandez does not describe or suggest many features recited in claim 1. For example, although Hernandez discloses "[c]arrying out (assigning and defining conversion rules) the mapping between the legacy system and R/3." Hernandez does not disclose or suggest receiving, via a graphical user interface, user input that indicates a user defined rule is to be used to create a rule template and, in response, creating a rule template that includes, among other elements, an attribute value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding condition of the user defined rule, as required by claim 1. See Hernandez at page 206, line 15. Nor does Hernandez disclose receiving a user input that indicates a value to be used in place of the attribute value placeholder and, in response, creating a second user defined rule to process textual information, where the second user defined rule is based on the rule template and includes the value to be used in place of the attribute value placeholder, also as required by amended claim 1.

Ball which is cited by the action as disclosing an attribute value, is directed to providing multiple interfaces that includes at least one interface capable of understanding natural language. See Ball at col. 1, lines 58-62 (summarizing invention). Ball does not describe or suggest receiving, via a graphical user interface, user input that indicates a user defined rule to be used to create a rule template and, in response, creating a rule template that includes, among other elements, an attribute value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding condition of the user defined rule. Nor does the action assert that Ball does so. Hence, Ball does not remedy the failure of Hernandez to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claim 1, as amended.

Art Unit: 2129

Accordingly, neither Hernandez, Ball nor any proper combination of the references, describes or suggests receiving, via a graphical user interface, user that indicates a user defined rule is to be used to create a rule template and, in response, creating a rule template that includes, among other elements, an attribute value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding condition of the user defined rule, as required by claim 1. For at least these reasons, applicant request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and claims 4, 6, and 9, which depend from claim 1.

Independent claims 18 and 20 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, and do so in context of a computer readable medium and system, respectively. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 18 and 20.

Examiner's response:

Hernandez discloses GUI and the creation of a function. A 'rule template' of applicant is equivalent to 'function builder' of Hernandez. The 'user defined rule' of applicant is the purpose/role of the function itself. 'Attribute placeholder' of applicant is the data field for the incoming data for the function. Transferring data from a legacy system would be the value to be placed within the attribute value placeholder. The 'second user defined rule' of applicant would be the 'rules' needed to make the transfer of data from the legacy system to the R/3 system. Ball is introduced to illustrate a specific 'attribute value'. Since applicant gives little detail about the invention, the Examiner is entitled to interpret the claims in the broadest possible sense.

8. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Claims 2, 3, and 5 each of which depends from claim 1, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hernandez I view of Ball and Whelihan (U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0129659). Whelihan, which is cited in the action for disclosing 'storing the rule template in a repository accessible to the user' and 'a user defined rule contain[ing] a plurality of conditions.' Does not remedy the failure of

Art Unit: 2129

Hernandez, Ball or any proper combination of the references, to describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of rejections of claims 2m 3m and 5.

Examiner's response:

Whelian discloses a database which the user can access. 'A user defined rule containing a plurality of conditions' of applicant is the function of Hernandez. All functions have a set of input requirements. Therefore the database which contains the function(s) contains a 'user defined rule containing a plurality of conditions' of applicant.

9. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Claims 7 and 8 each of which depends from claim 1, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hernandez in view of Ball and Sharpe ("Teach Yourself SAP R/3). Sharpe which is cited in the action for disclosing aspects of an attribute value placeholder, does not remedy the failure of Hernandez, Ball or any proper combination of the references, to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claim 1.

For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 7 and 8..

Examiner's response:

Sharpe is used to disclose 'Attribute-value placeholder' and 'placeholder symbol' of applicant is equivalent to 'item field' and the actual 'item field' in the display of Sharpe.

Art Unit: 2129

10. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Claims 10, 11, 17, 19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hernandez in view of Morwood (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0091695). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections because any proper combination of Hernandez and Morwood does not describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 10, 19 and 21.

Examiner's response:

Morwood is used to illustrate more detail concerning 'Action name' and 'value' of applicant. 'Action name' and 'value' of applicant is equivalent to 'name' and 'filePrefix' of Morwood.

11. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Amended claim 10 recites a computer implemented method that displays a graphical user interface (GUI) on a display device of a computer, where the GUI includes a representation of an action of a user defined rule to process textual information. The method includes creating, in response to the received user input, a rule template having an action that is based upon the action of the user defined rule, where the action of the rule template includes a value placeholder that is associated with the value from the corresponding action of the user defined rule. The method also includes creating, in response to user input, a second user defined rule to process textual information, where the second user defined rule is based on the rule template and includes the value to be used in place of the value placeholder.

As described above, Hernandez discloses '[c]arrying out (assigning and defining conversion rules) the mapping between the legacy systems and R/3'. See Hernandez at page 206, line 15. Hernandez, however does not describe or suggest creating, in response to the received user input, a rule template having an action that is based upon the action of the user defined rule, where the action of the rule template includes a value placeholder that is associated with the value from the corresponding action of the user defined rule as required by claim 10.

Morwood is directed to a remote computation framework. See Morwood at abstract. The action relies on Morwood as disclosing an action that includes an action name and

Art Unit: 2129

value. As such, Morwood does not remedy the failure of Hernandez to describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 10.

For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claim 10 and its dependent claims 11 and 17.

Independent claims 19 and 21 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 10, and do so in context of a computer readable medium and system, respectively. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 10, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 19 and 21.

Examiner's response:

'Rule template' of applicant is equivalent to 'function builder' of Hernandez. 'User defined rule' of applicant is equivalent to the contents of the function itself which the user defines. 'Value placeholder' of applicant is the field where the incoming data is placed.

12. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Claims 12, 13 and 14 each of which depends from claim 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hernandez in view of Morwood and Whelihan. Similarly to the rejection of claims 2, 3, and 5, Whelihan is cited in the action for disclosing 'storing the rule template in a repository accessible to the user' and 'a user defined rule contain[ing] a plurality of actions'. Whelihan does not remedy the failure of Hernandez, Morwood or any proper combination of the references, to describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 10. For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 12, 13 and 14.

Claims 15 and 16 each of which depends from claim 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hernandez in view of Morwood and Sharpe. Sharpe, which is cited in the action for disclosing aspects of a value placeholder, does not remedy the failure of Hernandez, Morwood or any proper combination of the references, to describe or suggest the subject matter in claim 10. For at least these

Art Unit: 2129

reasons, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 15 and 16.

Applicant identification of the difference between the claims and the applied references (e.g., Hernandez, Ball, Sharp, Morwood and Whelihan) should not be taken as an admission that any of the applied references properly constitute prior art.

Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and request that the examiner issue a notice of allowance.

It is believed that all pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issues with regards to the claim, as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Examiner's response:

In response to Applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the Examiner recognizes that references cannot be arbitrarily combined and that there must be some reason why one skilled in the art would be motivated to make the proposed combination of references. In re Nomiya, 184 USPQ 607 (CCPA 1975).

However, there is no requirement that a motivation to make the modification be expressly articulated. The test for combining references is not what individual references themselves suggest but rather what the combination of disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re Keller, 648 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Sernaker, 702 F.2d 989, 217 USPQ 1 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re McLaughlin, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). References are evaluated by what



they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosures. In re Bozek, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969).

### ***Examination Considerations***

13. The claims and only the claims form the metes and bounds of the invention. "Office personnel are to give the claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d, 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969)" (MPEP p 2100-8, c 2, I 45-48; p 2100-9, c 1, I 1-4). The Examiner has the full latitude to interpret each claim in the broadest reasonable sense. Examiner will reference prior art using terminology familiar to one of ordinary skill in the art. Such an approach is broad in concept and can be either explicit or implicit in meaning.

14. Examiner's Notes are provided to assist the applicant to better understand the nature of the prior art, application of such prior art and, as appropriate, to further indicate other prior art that maybe applied in other office actions. Such comments are entirely consistent with the intent and sprit of compact prosecution. However, and unless otherwise stated, the Examiner's Notes are not prior art but link to prior art that one of ordinary skill in the art would find inherently appropriate.

15. Examiner's Opinion: Paragraphs 13 and 14 apply. The Examiner has full latitude to interpret each claim in the broadest reasonable sense.

***Conclusion***

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

17. Claims 1-21 are rejected.

***Correspondence Information***

18. Any inquiry concerning this information or related to the subject disclosure should be directed to the Examiner Peter Coughlan, whose telephone number is (571) 272-5990. The Examiner can be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:15 a.m. to 3:45 p.m.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor David Vincent can be reached at (571) 272-3687. Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks,  
Washington, D. C. 20231;

Hand delivered to:

Receptionist,  
Customer Service Window,  
Randolph Building,  
401 Dulany Street,  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313,  
(located on the first floor of the south side of the Randolph Building);

Art Unit: 2129

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 (for formal communications intended for entry.)

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).



Peter Coughlan

11/24/2006



11/24/06  
DAVID VINCENT  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER